

(b) (6)

From: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 2:28 PM
To: PortlandHarbor
Subject: FW: Harbor Comments

Laura Knudsen

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Superfund | Environmental Protection Specialist Tel 503-326-3280

(b) (6)

"Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm" (Ralph Waldo Emerson)

Please Note: I am currently on detail to the EPA Region 10 office in Portland, Oregon until July 23, 2016. Thank you!

-----Original Message-----

From: drupal_admin@epa.gov [mailto:drupal_admin@epa.gov]
 Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 8:47 PM
 To: HarborComments <HarborComments@epa.gov>
 Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 06/30/2016 11:46PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email: (b) (6)

Your Comments:

The superfund area in question took many years of degradation by corporations and federal agencies to get to this unhealthy state. The corporations were making big profits and the agencies were reaping the benefits while polluting our river to the detriment of our health and natural areas and resources.

The concerned entities were not charged adequate cleanup bonding and the government failed to monitor the resulting contamination even though they were charged with doing so by public law.

Therefore, a quick fix such as the alternative that you have chosen (I) that lets the parties responsible for this mess off the hook in a relatively short period of time is not adequate for the people of Portland. The entities that were responsible for degrading the river, even if they are upland, should bear the responsibility and costs of RESTORING the site as close as possible to its original state. Alternatives G and H seem to meet this requirement much better than I.

It is understood that alternatives H and G will take longer and be more expensive or "less cost effective", as the report states but the result will come much closer to achieving the restoration goal. As stated earlier, this section of the river took industry a long time to degrade and much profit was made in doing so. It is only fair and equitable that some of this time and profit be returned to make this area right for the people of Portland and the Pacific Northwest.

It seems to me that Alternative I is simply a "band aid" approach and will achieve very little in the way of a long term fix. Santa Monica Bay, went through a similar "fix" and it is poated that Californians are in danger if they eat 3 ounces of fish out of the Bay. How many ounces of fish will Portlanders be safe eating out of the Willamette 2 or none?